1 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command:	Division:	Number:
Buttonwillow	Central	
Evaluated by:		Date:
Officer Justin C	Ison	11252009
Assisted by:		Date:
N/A		

applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shad discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exception Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up anspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only	tions Docum and/or correc	nent and add ctive action(s	dressed to t s) taken. If	the next level this form is us	of command.
	Lead Insp	ector's Signat	nte.		
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Loud mop	$^{\circ}$			
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level	1	nt On	<u>-</u>		
Executive Office Level Voluntary Self-Inspection					
Follow-up Required:	Command	ler's Signature	9:		Date:
Follow-up Inspection	11	IN			12092009
Yes No	Ald	Spean	_		
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6					
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for e	xplanatior		
1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy,

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	⊠ Yes	□Nö	□ N/A	Remarks:
Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget. 	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

	18. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	19. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	20. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	21. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	22. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
K	Questions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Manageme	nt Unit	encaring y		
	23. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	24. Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	25. Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	26. Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Command: Fort Tejon	Division: Central	Number: 6
Evaluated by: Sergeant M. Rh	oades, #9242	Date: 10-6-2009
Assisted by:		Date:

applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Except Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up an Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only or	be comme ions Docum nd/or correc	nted on via t nent and add tive action(s	the "Remar Iressed to t s) taken. If	ks" section. A he next level this form is us	Additionally, such of command.
				7	
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Executive Office Level Voluntary Self-Inspection	Lead Inspe	ector's Signat	ure:/ Value	<i>-</i>	
Follow-up Required: The security of the Level of the Voluntary Self-Inspection of the Level of the	Command	er's Signature	on L	T	Date: 10 - 6 - 2009
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6					
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section 1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the	shall be ut	tilized for e	xplanation	Remarks:	
appropriate assistant commissioner? 2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
 Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)? 	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	
Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

7.	Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects	Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	coded as "for local benefit"?				
8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
11.	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12.	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks
13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15.	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17.	Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: • Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. • Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
19	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
20.	. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	it Unit			
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24.	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis	☐ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?				
25.	Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive	Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page	1	of	2
------	---	----	---

120-1

Command: Sonora Area	Division; Central	Chapter:
Inspected by:		Date:
A. K. Pittman		12/10/2009

number of the inspection in the Chapter In shall be routed to and its due date. This d	nspectio documer	Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or fin number. Under "Forward to:" enter the neint shall be utilized to document innovative protion plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be	actices, suggestions for statewide
Follow-up Required:	vel Forwar Due Da	Ber - G	Corrective Action Plan Included Attachments Included
Chapter Inspection Chapter 6 Inspector's Comments Regard Command Suggestions for Sta	ling In	7047	jement.
were found during this inspecti	ion.		partmental policies or procedures etion of the CHP 415 for overtime
Commander's Response: ⊠ C	Concu	r or 🗌 Do Not Concur (Do Not Cor	ncur shall document basis for response)
Inspector's Comments: Shall a etc.)	ddress	non concurrence by commander (e.g.,	findings revised, findings unchanged,

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

compliance with departmental policy.

Do not concur

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division	Chapter:	
Sonora Area	Central	6	
Inspected by:		Date:	
A. K. Pittman		12/10/2009	

9		
Employee would like to discuss this report with	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
the reviewer.	00 R	1/10
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	Januare, CT.	12/10/09
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE
		12/10/09
Reviewer discussed this report with	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

Required Action 1.

Corrective Action Plan/Timeline: <u>Command Overtime</u>: (6) A briefing item has been prepared and placed in the Area Briefing Book to address and mitigate this issue and bring Sonora Area in

employee Concur

Page 1 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Command: Sonora	Division: Central	Number: 425
Evaluated by: A. K. Pittman	A)	Date: 12/10/2009
Assisted by: N/A		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answer applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Excepti Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up are Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only of	be commen ons Docume nd/or correct	ted on via th ent and addr ive action(s)	e "Remarks essed to the taken. If th	s" section. Additionally, such e next level of command. nis form is used as a Follow-up
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Lead Inspe	ctor's Signatu	re:	
<u>_</u>				
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level	1	1	1/1	= , 56T
☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	07/	() har		,
Follow-up Required:		er's Signature:		Date:
☐ Yes No	M.	Sun	na,	ct. 12/11/09
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6			.52	
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	planation	建筑地产程度发展
1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Commander is not aware of any agency in the Sonora Area submitting a grant application as described.
2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Services described not required.
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No concept papers generated
6. Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No concept paper budgets prepared.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

7.	acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grant projects coded "for local benefit" submitted.
8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12.	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15.	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No purchases over \$5,000 were made by this command.
16.	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17.	Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: • Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. • Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	Yes	□ No	N/A	Remarks: No applications for federal funds were initiated by this command.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

18	Federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No unbudgeted grant requests were made by this command.
	. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No request for unanticipated federal funds were initiated by this command.
20	. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program were initiated by this command.
22	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grant applications related to Homeland Security were initiated by this command
	aubiliation to the futiulity agency?	1			
Quest	ions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit	- 5.整	MANAGE AND	
23	ions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen . Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	t Unit	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
23	ions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen . Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway		I CO CENTRA DE LA VICENCIA DE	□ N/A	Remarks:
24	ions 23 through 26 perfain to the Grants Managemen Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program? Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive	☐ Yes	□ No		

1 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

16618582694

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

Command:	Division:	Number:
Grapevine Insp. Fac.	Central	
Evaluated by: S. Netzer, Lt.		Date: 11/19/2009
Assisted by: N/A		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level □ Command Level S. Netzer ☐ Executive Office Level □ Voluntary Self-Inspection Follow-up Required: Commander's Signature: Date: ☐ Follow-up Inspection 11/19/2009 THE My ☐ Yes ⊠ No For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 NOTES IN STOP MAKE OF MERCHECKER THE AREA FOR RESERVOIR FOR THE DEMONSTRATION AND AREA FOR THE SECOND FOR THE FORMAL PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY If the commander became aware that another ☐ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: agency or organization is proposing or has submitted ☐ Yes a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? 2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities ☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A Remarks: for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations? Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs ☐ Yes ⊠ No □ N/A Remarks: identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration? Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for Yes Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? Are concept papers regarding grant funding ☐ Yes submitted through channels to Grants Management ☐ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: Unit (GMU)? Was GMU contacted to determine the current

☐ Yes

☐ No

⊠ N/A

Remarks

personnel billing rates used for grant projects when

preparing concept paper budgets?

Page 2 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

7.	acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
9.	availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks;
	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
William .	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
17.	Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

3 of 3

Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

		The same of the sa			
18.	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	submitted to the funding agency?				
11.00					
	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway		_		Remarks:
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program? Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	-

*Note:

Area has not received grant overtime in this past year.

12-1609

Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

*		
Command: Bakersfield Area	Division: Central	Number - Risker
Evaluated by: Sergeant L. E. McGu	ire, ID 12883	Date: 12/14/2009
Assisted by:		Date:

===						· ·
discr	RUCTIONS: Answer individual cable legal statues, or deficienci epancies and/or deficiencies shatermore, the Exceptions Documention, the "Follow-up Inspection"	all be documented on an Excep	tions Docun	nent and ad	ldressed to	the next level of command.
TYPE	OF INSPECTION		Lead Insp	ector's Signa	ture:	
	- D D	☑ Command Level			2/1)
□ E>	xecutive Office Level	Voluntary Self-Inspection		2 9		<i>5</i> —
	ollow-up Required:		Command	ler's,Şignatur	e:	Date:
	☐ Yes	Follow-up Inspection	10	K.	ma	12/15/19
	pplicable policy, refer to:					1. 11. 101
1.	If a "No" or "N/A" box is ched If the commander became	aware that another	shall be ut	tilized for e	explanation	
	agency or organization is a grant application to a fun Office of Traffic Safety (OT on traffic safety goals clear the Department, did the coappropriate assistant comm	proposing or has submitted ding agency other than the S) that appears to focus rly within the jurisdiction of mmander notify the nissioner?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The commander is not aware of any other agencies submitting a proposal affecting CHP jurisdiction.
3.	Has OTS grant funding, the Plan, been sought for traffic for the purpose of conduction engineering studies, system implementations?	c safety-related activities ng inventories, need and n development or program	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: The Bakersfield Area has received at least one grant every year for at least the last five years.
	Has the command sought of the expenses associated widentified by the National H Administration?	ith the priority programs ighway Traffic Safety	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
4. 5.	Has the commander ensure being reallocated to fund ot non-reimbursable overtime	her programs or used for expenditures?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
6.	Are concept papers regardi submitted through channels Unit (GMU)?	s to Grants Management	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Ü.	Was GMU contacted to determine personnel billing rates used preparing concept paper but	for grant projects when	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

Is supporting documentation of consent and		1		
acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grants have been submitted coded as "for local benefit."
revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU? 		□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU? Are all requirements of the contained.	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: The final project report for the grant that expired in 2009 was completed by the Project Director.
14. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grant funded equipment was purchased in 2009.
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grant funded equipment was purchased in 2009.
16. Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget. 	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area has not submitted any grant requests that qualify.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

ž (

	LIS d letteral Standard Form 424 Application for			7	"1"
	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area has not submitted any grant requests that qualify
	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area has not submitted any grant requests that qualify
	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area has not submitted any grant requests that qualify
	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Area has not submitted any grant requests that qualify
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit		ALKS A THE	
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders			2017512	
	soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program? Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25.	soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program? Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive		_		

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
MCSU	Central	Chapter 6
Inspected by:		Date:
G. Kawahat	a	12/14/09

Page 1 of 2

	Inspection docume	on number. Under "Forw ent shall be utilized to do	ard to:" enter the r cument innovative	
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level Command L Executive Office Level	.evel	Total hours expende inspection: 2.0 hours	d on the	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to:		
☐ Yes	Due D	ate:		
Chapter Inspection: Chapter	6 – Co	mmand Grant Mar	agement	
Inspector's Comments Regar	ding Ir	nnovative Practices	S:	
		*		70
Command Suggestions for St	tatewic	le Improvement:		18
:				
Inspector's Findings:		-d		
All overtime is managed i	n acco	rdance with Depa	tmental polici	es and procedures.
Commander's Response:	Concu	ır or 🗌 Do Not Cor	cur (Do Not Co	ncur shall document basis for response)
(* 0)				
				s.
Inspector's Comments: Shall a	address	non concurrence by o	ommander (e.a.	, findings revised, findings unchanged,

etc.)

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
MCSU	Central	Chapter 6
Inspected by: G. Kawahata		Date: 12/14/09

1	
Required Action	
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	
Corrective Action Flam Timeline	

Employee would like to discuss this report with	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
the reviewer.	ξ.	
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)		
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE
Reviewer discussed this report with	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
employee		
☐ Concur ☐ Do not concur		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command:	Division:	Number:
MCSU	Central	
Evaluated by:	a -	Date:
G. Kawahata		12/14/2009
Assisted by:		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection Date: Commander's Signature: Follow-up Required: ☐ Follow-up Inspection ⊠ No Yes For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. If the commander became aware that another ⊠ N/A Remarks: Not applicable to agency or organization is proposing or has submitted ☐ Yes ☐ No a grant application to a funding agency other than the this Unit Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities ☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations? Has the command sought grant funding to assist with N/A the expenses associated with the priority programs ☐ Yes ☐ No Remarks: Not applicable to identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety this Unit Administration? 4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for Yes No □ N/A Remarks: non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? Are concept papers regarding grant funding ☐ Yes □ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: Not applicable to submitted through channels to Grants Management this Unit Unit (GMU)? Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when ⊠ N/A ☐ Yes ☐ No Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit preparing concept paper budgets?

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
 Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU? 	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
 17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed 	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
the amount specified in the budget.				

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

18.	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
19.	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
20.	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21.	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Rema Not applicable to this Unit rks:
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit			
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	t Unit	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not applicable to this Unit
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway		□ No	⊠ N/A	
24.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program? Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive	☐ Yes	StR		this Unit Remarks: Not applicable to

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Command:	Division:	Number:
	Central	Six
Evaluated by:		Date:
Sergeant S. Go	ddard, ID 15220	12/09/2009
Assisted by:		Date:
AGPA P. Heintz,	ID A10585	12/09/2009

====							
applica discrep	able legal statues, or deficien pancies and/or deficiencies s rmore, the Exceptions Docur	al items with "Yes" or "No" answers ncies noted in the inspections shall shall be documented on an Excepti ment shall include any follow-up an on" box shall be marked and only d	be commen ons Docume d/or correct	ited on via tr ent and addr ive action(s)	e "Remark essed to th taken. If th	s section. F e next level nis form is us	of command.
			Lead Inspe	ctor's Signatu	ıre:		
TYPE C	F INSPECTION						
Div.	ision Level	○ Command Level				0	
	ISION ECVE	⊠ command zever	_	5. Gal	Kn	P	
□Fxe	ecutive Office Level	Voluntary Self-Inspection					
	llow-up Required:		Commande	er's Signature:			Date:
'	mon ap reganoa.	☐ Follow-up Inspection					
] Yes ⊠ No	1	_5	. Gel	and	Em-	12/22/09
	Tes No					1	1 1 1
For ap	oplicable policy, refer to	c: GO 40.6					12
			L II L	ilimed for o	unlanation	IVE SEAVENE	
		hecked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	kpianation T		The American Property of the Control
1.			⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	agency or organization	is proposing or has submitted funding agency other than the	□ I les		L 1300 5	, tomerna	
		OTS) that appears to focus					
	on traffic safety goals of	early within the jurisdiction of					
	the Department, did the	commander notify the					
	appropriate assistant co						
2.		through the Highway Safety					
		affic safety-related activities		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	for the purpose of condu	ucting inventories, need and					
		stem development or program					
	implementations?				5		
3.		ht grant funding to assist with	57		[] NUA	Remarks	
		d with the priority programs	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks.	
	identified by the Nationa	al Highway Traffic Safety					
	Administration?	and an anti-					
4.		sured grant funds are not d other programs or used for	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks	
	_non-reimbursable overti		M 162			11011101110	
5	Are concept papers rega						
J.		nels to Grants Management	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks	
	Unit (GMU)?		1=1				
6.	Was GMU contacted to	determine the current			11222-1207-207-2	9050 HOLD	
		sed for grant projects when		☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks	
	preparing concept paper						

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

7	Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
8	revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled through Grants Man. Unit (GMU)
9	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	O. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
1	 Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU? 	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12	2. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
1;	3. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled by GMU
14	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Handled by GMU
16	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	⊡ N/A	Remarks:
17	 Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget. 	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

3 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

10	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
19	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
20	. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21.	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
		Charles and the Control of the Contr		NET COULD AND THE AMERICA	
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit	SA GIREN		8) C. (1 Ch. S. (20 S.) (24.5) (1 (24.5) (1) (24.5) (1 (25.5)
Questi 23.	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway		□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program? Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive	Yes			

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Grant Management

Command:	Division:	Number:
Coalinga	Central	495
Evaluated by:		Date:
Sergeant J. Hunt, #15778		June 18, 2009
Assisted by:		Date:

applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION □ Command Level Division Level ☐ Executive Office Level Voluntary Self-Inspection Date: Commander's Signature: Follow-up Required: ☐ Follow-up Inspection 4/29/09 X No Yes For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. If the commander became aware that another □ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: ☐ Yes agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety ⊠ No □ N/A Remarks: Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities ☐ Yes for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations? 3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with ☐ Yes ⊠ No □ N/A Remarks: the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration? 4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not □ N/A ⊠ Yes ☐ No Remarks: being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? 5. Are concept papers regarding grant funding ☐ Yes ☐ No \square N/A Remarks: submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)? 6. Was GMU contacted to determine the current ⊠ N/A Remarks: ☐ Yes No personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy,

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	14. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
0	15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	 17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget. 	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

	Federa Clearin	deral Standard Form 424, Application for all Assistance, filed with the State ghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant ts received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	19. Has an the crite	y request for unanticipated federal funds met eria for legislative notification set forth in Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	20. Are gra	nt funds being used for their intended e?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Safety / through	nt applications related to the Motor Carrier Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed the Commercial Vehicle Section before they mitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Security Emerge	nt applications related to the Homeland Grant Program being routed through the ncy Operations Section before they are ded to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
		hrough 26 pertain to the Grants Manageme	nt Unit			
	23. Has GM Memora soliciting	IU prepared an annual Management andum to be disseminated to all commanders g participation in the Department's Highway Program?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	to a mer Division	U send the concept paper as an attachment morandum through the Planning and Analysis to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and at Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive ats?	Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	using the to all cor	J route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement e CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, mmands with responsibility for or that have est in the project?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
_		lemorandum of Understanding between				

1 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Grant Management

Command:	Division:	Number:
Porterville	Central	
Evaluated by:		Date:
Sergeant C.W	I. Boudreaux	11-13-2009
Assisted by:		Date:
Sergeant R. Cox		11-16-2009

applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION Command Level Division Level Executive Office Level Voluntary Self-Inspection Commander Follow-up Required: ☐ Follow-up Inspection No. Yes For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. If the commander became aware that another ⊠ N/A agency or organization is proposing or has submitted ☐ Yes ☐ No Remarks: a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? 2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety ⊠ N/A Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities ☐ Yes ☐ No Remarks: for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations? 3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with ⊠ No \square N/A Remarks: the expenses associated with the priority programs Yes identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration? 4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for ☐ No □ N/A Remarks: non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? 5. Are concept papers regarding grant funding □ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: submitted through channels to Grants Management ☐ Yes Unit (GMU)? Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when ☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A Remarks:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy,

preparing concept paper budgets?

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

7.	Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
12.	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
15.	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
16.	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
17.	Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: • Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. • Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

3 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

18	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
22	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit	E A LONG		
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
24.	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
25.	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
26.	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

1 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Grant Management

Division: Central	Number:
Howard	Date: 11/24/2009
	Date:
	Central

applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION Command Level M Division Level Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection Commander's Signature: Follow-up Required: Date: Follow-up Inspection 12.8 09 ⊠ No Yes For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 Note: If a INO for IN/Aspox is checked the IRemarks, section shall be utilized for explanation. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted X Yes □ No □ N/A Remarks: a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? 2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety ✓ Yes □ N/A Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities ∏ No Remarks: for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations? Has the command sought grant funding to assist with ▼ Yes □ No □ N/A Remarks: the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration? Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for X Yes ☐ No □ N/A Remarks: non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? 5. Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management ☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: Not performed at Area level Unit (GMU)? Was GMU contacted to determine the current ☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: Not performed at personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets? Area level

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy,

Page 2 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

_			~			
	7,	acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks; None submitted / No local benefit grant projects
	8.	revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	9.	availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not performed at Area level
		Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
		Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	12.	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	15.	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	16,	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	No	□ N/A	Remarks: Radar enforcement trailer used in conjunction with speed enforcement grants
		Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not performed at Area level

Page 3 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

1	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not performed at Area level
	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not performed at Area level
	Are grant funds being used for their Intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	 Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency? 	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None submitted from local Area level
2	2. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	∐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None submitted from local Area level
/Ques	tions 29 through 26 pental nito the Grants Managemen	typalt #			
/Ques 2:		tavaita na	□ No	D N/A	Remarks:
2:	tions:23tthrough:26tpentalinto the Grants:Managemen 3. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway				Remarks:
2.	tions 22 time ugh 26 pental inforther and si Management 3. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program? 4. Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Command: Modesto Area	Division: Central Division	Number:
Evaluated by: Sergeant G. P. Crabb, ID 11316		Date: 12-03-09
Assisted by: N/A		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.						
Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only de	eticient items	s need to be	re-mspecie	su.		
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Lead Inspec	ctor's Signatur	re:			
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level	5	D Ax	1. 1. 1. 1.	567	11316	
Executive Office Level Voluntary Self-Inspection	f2.	r's Signature:	nar		Date:	
Follow-up Required:	Commande	2 L			12.04.09	
☐ Yes ☐ No For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6	-t11 bb12	lined for a	volanation	70 050 0 000		
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section 1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A		Refer to page 3.	
2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?	☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	Refer to page 3.	
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks	Refer to page 3.	
Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks		
5. Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks	: Refer to page 3,	
Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks	: Refer to page 3,	

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

7.	Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
12.	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
15	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
16	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
17	 Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget. 	Yes	□ No	N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

18.	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21.	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Refer to page 3.
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemer	nt Unit	Weldness		至1000年1月1日日中央国际第二届第二届第二届
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24.	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25.	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
26.	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

Item 1: The commander is unaware of any allied agency grant proposals that have been submitted to OTS dealing with traffic safety goals in CHP jurisdiction.

The Modesto Area has not sought grant funding through National; Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NTTSA) and/or submitted concept papers for grant funding to the Grants Management Unit (GMU). All Area grant funding has been received from grants received by the CHP and distributed by Central Division. All grants were utilized in accordance with the established guidelines.

Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Command: Chowchilla	Division: Central	Number: 9464
Evaluated by: E. Cruz		Date: 11/4/09
Assisted by: N/A		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.							
	Lead Inspe	ctor's Signatu	re:				
TYPE OF INSPECTION	2002070						
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level	29	4/03	د ة				
☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspecti	on O			1			
Follow-up Required:		er's Signature:	12	11/5/09			
☐ Yes ⊠ No	L 7	104	7/	1.727.47			
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6							
Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" sec	tion shall be ut	ilized for ex	cplanation				
If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submit a grant application to a funding agency other than Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?	the s	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: There have been none.			
2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safe Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activitie for the purpose of conducting inventories, need an engineering studies, system development or progr implementations?	s	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Scale facility			
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist very the expenses associated with the priority program identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	vith s X Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used in non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	for Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: CRIF has not received any grant funds at this time			
5. Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Manageme Unit (GMU)?	nt 🛮 🖂 Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:			
6. Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects whe preparing concept paper budgets?	n 🛮 🖾 Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:			

Page 2 of 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

7.	Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None requested
8.		☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: CRIF has not received any grant funds at this time.
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10.	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
11.	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None awarded
12.	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None awarded
13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None awarded
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None awarded
15.	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None awarded
16.	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None awarded
17.	Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: • Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. • Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None requested

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

18	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None Requested
19.	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None Requested
	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: None Requested
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemer	nt Unit		D MAN	
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
24.	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
25.	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
26.	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GM 12	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Command: Merced	Division: Central	Number: 460			
Evaluated by: G. R. Lamers	on, Sergeant	Date: 12-10-09			
Assisted by:		Date:			

discre Furthe	RUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answer able legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall pancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exception and the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up a stion, the "Follow-up inspection" box shall be marked and only	II be comme tions Docun	ented on via nent and add ctive action(the "Remai dressed to "	rks" section. / the next level	Additionally, such
TYPE (DF INSPECTION	Lead Insp	ector's Signa	ture:		
	vision Level		20			
Ex	ecutive Office Level	(Jan			
Fo	ollow-up Required:	Command	ler's Signatur	e:		Date:
	Follow-up Inspection	2011	1/	100	//	12/14/09
	Yes 🛛 No	11/1	all for			12/18/01
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6						
1.	If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section If the commander became aware that another	shall be u	tilized for e	xplanation	١.	
	agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	become avagency grafocus on D	Command has not ware of any allied ant applications with pepartment's r jurisdiction.
	Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?	Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks: identified n	To date, no reed for this type of
3.	Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: S Mariposa A	SIDNEY Grant with Area.
	Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	⊠Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: N	No concept papers by Area.
6.	Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A		No concept papers

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

7 1					
acce by th as re 1250 code	upporting documentation of consent and eptance (of the work, goods, or services provided the state on behalf of a local government agency equired by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part (a) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects as "for local benefit"?	∐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No "for local benefit" grant projects worked by Area.
revis Direc	e all copies of the grant project agreements, ions, and claim invoices signed by the Project ctor, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grant agreements submitted.
avail fund GML		_	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
prior exce	all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU to entering into any obligations, with the ption of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
chan conta	quarterly progress reports forwarded though nels to GMU in accordance with the instructions ained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grants initiated by Area. No reports.
MOU	all requirements of the grant agreement and being met?	☐Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grants initiated by Area.
with t requi proje		☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grants initiated by Area. No reports.
projed	every invoice associated with a grant funded et contain the project number and name?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grants initiated by Area. No invoices.
acqui of \$5, Repo	Il purchases of grant-funded equipment red under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost 000 being documented on an Equipment rt, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grants initiated by Area. No equipment needed.
ensur respe	rant funded equipment been inspected to e it is being utilized in accordance with the ctive grant agreement?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grants initiated by Area. No equipment needed.
Gover appro Gover appro	oplications for federal funds in accordance with rement Code Section 13326 including obtaining val from the Department of Finance and/or the mor's office prior to submission to the priate federal authority? yould include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No application for federal funds by Area.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

18 Ic a todoral Standard Farm 404 Ameliant		1		
18. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No Standard Form 424 submitted by Area.
19. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No request for federal funds by Area.
20. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grants applications initiated by Area.
22. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: No grants applications initiated by Area.
Questions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit			
23. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24. Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25. Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6
Command Grant Management

Command: Oakhurst	Division: Central	Number:
Evaluated by: Lt. Sandra Adan	Date: 11-17-2009	
Assisted by: OT Susan Temp	Date: 11-17-2009	

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION Command Level Division Level Andra adams, co Commander's Signature:

Date:

Aandra Adams, it 12/11/09 Executive Office Level Voluntary Self-Inspection Follow-up Required: Follow-up Inspection Y No Yes For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. If the commander became aware that another Remarks: agency or organization is proposing or has submitted Yes □ No X N/A a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety □No X N/A Yes Remarks: Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations? 3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with □No X N/A Remarks: the expenses associated with the priority programs ☐ Yes identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration? Has the commander ensured grant funds are not No N/A Remarks: being reallocated to fund other programs or used for X Yes non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? Are concept papers regarding grant funding ☐ Yes □ No X N/A Remarks: submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)? Was GMU contacted to determine the current ☐ Yes □ No X N/A Remarks: personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

7.	Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
12.	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	X Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: As described to Area from Division operations plans
13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
15.	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
16.	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
17.	Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: • Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. • Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	Yes	□ No	X N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

18	. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
19.	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
20.	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	X Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21.	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks:
22.	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	X N/A	Remarks:
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit			
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24.	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
25.	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
26.	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
OAKHURST	CENTRAL	6
Inspected by:		Date:
SANDRA A	DAMS LI	12/11/09

Page 1 of 2

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be typed. Check appropriate boxes as necess number of the inspection in the Chapter Inspection number. Under "Forward to:" en shall be routed to and its due date. This document shall be utilized to document innumprovement, identified deficiencies, corrective action plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum	ter the next level of command where the document ovative practices, suggestions for statewide
TYPE OF INSPECTION Division Level X Command Level Executive Office Level Total hours expended on the inspection: 2 HOURS	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required: Forward to: Central Division	
Chapter Inspection: Chapter 6 Grants Management Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices:	
Command Suggestions for Statewide Improvement: Inspector's Findings:	
Area complies with all direction and use of overtime involved wi involved. Oakhurst Area has not generated any projects for whi the inspection did not apply to this command.	ith grants in which Central Division is ch grant money was applied. Much of
Commander's Response: x Concur or ☐ Do Not Concur (Do Not	ot Concur shall document basis for response)
Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commande etc.)	er (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,

CHP 680A (Rev. 02-09) OPI 010

None.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
DAKKHURST	CENTRAL	6
Inspected by:		Date:
LT SHNDRA ADAMS		12/11/03

	and the second s
Required Action: None	
	in the transfer of the Artenia of th
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline: None	

Employee would like to discuss this report with	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	Sandra adams it	12/11/2009
	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE
	Aandra adams, it	12/11/2009
Reviewer discussed this report with	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE
employee		
☐ Concur ☐ Do not concur		

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command:	Division: Central	Number:
Mariposa	Central	
Evaluated by: Sgt. Todd Weichers		Date:
		11-24-2009
Assisted by:		Date:

applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level □ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level □ Voluntary Self-Inspection Commander's Signature: Follow-up Required: Date: Follow-up Inspection ⊠ No Yes For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. 1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted Yes ΠNο ⊠ N/A Remarks: This has not a grant application to a funding agency other than the occurred in the Mariposa Area Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus during this rating period. on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? 2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities Yes X No □ N/A Remarks: No funds have for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and been sought for this purpose engineering studies, system development or program in the Mariposa Area. implementations? 3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs ⊠ Yes No □ N/A Remarks: Mariposa has identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety received grant funding for Administration? Comprehensive Approach to Reduce Speed (CARS II) and Border to Border Driving Under the Influence grants. 4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for ⊠ Yes ☐ No □ N/A Remarks: non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management ☐ Yes No \bowtie N/A Remarks: No concept papers Unit (GMU)? were submitted by Mariposa during this rating period. Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when Yes No

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy,

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

	preparing concept paper budgets?				were submitted by Mariposa during this rating period.
7.	acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: There have been no "for local benefit" grants submitted from the Mariposa Area during this rating period.
8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
17.	Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: • Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. • Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
	. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
	. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
	. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
22	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: Not during this rating period.
Quest	ions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemer	nt Unit			
23	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□ Ņo	□ N/A	Remarks:
26	. Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 1 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Mariposa	Central	6
Inspected by:		Date:
Sgt. Todd Weichers		11-24-2009

INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, cor	Inspection docume	on number. Under "Forw ent shall be utilized to doc	ard to:" enter the nex cument innovative pra	Il in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter of level of command where the document actices, suggestions for statewide used if additional space is required.
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Total hours expende	d on the	Corrective Action Plan Included	
☐ Division Level ☐ Command L	ovel	inspection: 3	u on the	Corrective Action Plan Included
Division Level & Command L	.evei			Attachments Included
Executive Office Level				Attachments included
			1	
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to: al Division		
	Due D			
Yes No	- SX 1714	1 3 4 7 1 1 1 X X 1 1 1	DOSE RICE AND	
Chapter Inspection:	19-54		Wind to St was 18	The state of the s
			MEMORY STEELS	NISTA VIII. ARTIE IN DAN DE ATABITE DA
Inspector's Comments Regar				
The Mariposa Area utilizes mo	nies fi	om the Border to E	Border DUI Enfo	procement Grant not just for roving
DUI enforcement and DUI che	ск рог	nts, but for the Sim	iulated Impaired	DriviNg Experience or "SIDNE
program. This program is a ba	aπery μ	oowered venicie th	at simulates the	e effects of impairment from
and colleges and universities t	Orist S	ariving skills. The	program is perf	ormed at local area high schools
and colleges and universities t	.i ii ougi	nout the State.		
Command Suggestions for St	tatewic	de Improvement		
None.	Latovic	ac improvement.		
Tions.				
Inspector's Findings:				
The inspector found no discrep	pancie	s in the Mariposa	Area with the ex	ception of "RDO" not being
placed in the notes section of t	the da	ily 415 when overt	me is worked o	n a regular day off (RDO). This
was simply an oversight as da	ys off	are checked regula	arly on the mast	er schedule when overtime is
worked to insure the day isn't d	other t	han a RDO when v	vorked during n	ormal work hours.
Commander's Response:	Concu	ır or 🗌 Do Not Cor	ncur (Do Not Cond	cur shall document basis for response)
The Mariposa Area understand	ds the	importance of gran	nt funding and it	s proper implementation to assist
in achieving the goals set forth	in the	Departments 200	8-2010 Strategi	c Plan. Not only will utilizing grant
funds reduce the number of DI	JI driv	ers on California's	roadways but it	will reduce the number of
collisions and the mileage dea	th rate	, making the road	vays safer for a	Il motorists driving throughout the
State.				

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 3

Command: Mariposa	Division: Central	Chapter:	
Inspected by: Sgt. Todd We	eichers	Date: 11-24-2009	

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged, etc.)

Supervisors will ensure "RDO" is placed in the notes section when overtime is worked on a regular day off.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Mariposa	Central	6
Inspected by:		Date:
Sgt. Todd We	ichers	11-24-2009

Required Action	
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	
None.	

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.	GNATURE DATE
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	LAM, CT. 11/30/09
INSPECTOR'S SIE	Tak DATE 11-24-2009
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	NATURE DATE
☐ Concur ☐ Do not concur	

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter:	
Madera	Central	6	
Inspected by:		Date:	
D. Paris	- K	11/04/09	

Page 1 of 3

number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This	Inspecti docume	Check appropriate boxes as necessary, or for number. Under "Forward to:" enter the neent shall be utilized to document innovative praction plans. A CHP 51 Memorandum may be	actices, suggestions for statewide		
TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Lev ☐ Executive Office Level		Total hours expended on the inspection: 3 Hours	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included		
Follow-up Required:	Forwa	rd to:			
☐ Yes No	Due D	ate: 11/23/09			
Chapter Inspection: Inspector's Comments Regar		provetive Practices:	a de la como de la com		
		itiated or reviewed at the commar	nd level.		
Command Suggestions for St	atewic	e Improvement:			
No comment at this time					
Inspector's Findings:					
Command is operating within the parameters of all grant funded projects. Overtime reimbursable contracts are monitored and all related documents are reviewed for accurate documentation of project. All civil declarations are properly recorded on the CHP 90, included is the CHP 415 with accurate and thorough recordation of the time.					
Commander's Response: \(\subseteq \text{Concur or } \subseteq \text{Do Not Concur (Do Not Concur shall document basis for response)} \)					

Inspector's Comments: Shall address non concurrence by commander (e.g., findings revised, findings unchanged,

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMSEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:	22
Madera	Central	6	
Inspected by:		Date:	
D. Paris		11/04/09	

etc.)	
0,007	

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM .EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter	
Madera	Central	б	
Inspected by:		Date:	
D. Paris		11/04/09	

A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O
Required Action Action and the second and the secon
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline

N/A

Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 11/12/09
(COC) III III CIII, CIIIAPICI C ICI SPPECI PIOCESIII III	INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATE 11/05/09
Reviewer discussed this report with employee Concur Do not concur	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Command: Madera	Division: Central	Number: 450
Evaluated by: D. Paris		Date: 11/04/09
Assisted by: B. Hefner		Date: 11/04/09

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.							
TYPE O	F INSPECTION	Lead Inspector's Signature:					
		M Commond Lovel					
	ision Level	⊠ Command Level		. /		/	
☐ Exe	cutive Office Level	☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	1	27, c	~ F		
Fo	llow-up Required:	☐ Follow-up Inspection	Commande	er's Signature			Date:
] Yes 🛛 No				cm		11/4/09
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6							
Note:	f.a "No" or "N/A" box is ch	necked, the "Remarks" section	shall be ut	ilized for ex	xplanation		
1.	If the commander becan agency or organization is a grant application to a f Office of Traffic Safety (ne aware that another s proposing or has submitted funding agency other than the OTS) that appears to focus early within the jurisdiction of commander notify the	∏ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A		Has not occurred.
2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?			☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?			☐ Yes	⊠ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
4.	Has the commander ens	sured grant funds are not i other programs or used for me expenditures?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
5.	Are concept papers rega		Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	Has not occurred.
6.	Was GMU contacted to	sed for grant projects when	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:	Has not occurred.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
8. Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
9. Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
14. Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
15. Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
 17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget. 	Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

11	3. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
20	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21	. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
22	Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks:
	submitted to the funding agency?				
Quest	submitted to the funding agency? ions 23 fhrough 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Umit			
23	ions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	t.⊍nit □ Yes	∏ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
23	ions 23 (through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen . Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway			□ N/A	Remarks:
23	ions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program? Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive	☐ Yes	□ No		

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command: Hanford Area	Division: Central Division	Number:
Evaluated by: Doug Puder, ID 10045		Date: 11/20/2009
Assisted by: N/A		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead Inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level X Command Level Executive Office Level Voluntary Self-Inspection Follow-up Required: Commander's Signature: Follow-up Inspection 11/20/2009 Yes X No For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation. Remarks: 1. If the commander became aware that another X N/A Not aware that this has agency or organization is proposing or has submitted ☐ Yes □ No occurred locally. a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? 2. Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Remarks: We have contacted Grants X No N/A Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities ☐ Yes Management Unit but the for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and requirements of such a engineering studies, system development or program implementations? submission were too cumbersome and time consuming. Remarks: Has the command sought grant funding to assist with □ N/A See above. the expenses associated with the priority programs X No Yes identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration? Remarks: 4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not X Yes □ No □ N/A being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? 5. Are concept papers regarding grant funding Remarks: X No □ N/A We have contacted Grants submitted through channels to Grants Management ☐ Yes Unit (GMU)? Management Unit but the requirements of such a submission were too cumbersome and time consuming.

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

0 10 0011				iii
6. Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?	Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks: None submitted
7. Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	Yes	□ No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area
Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area
 Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU? 	Yes	□ No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area
10. Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area
11. Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area
12. Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area
13. Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area
Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area
Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area
Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area
 17. Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. 	Yes	□ No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Application for the Lorentz Control of the Lo				
Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the federal funds which exceed				
the amount specified in the budget.				
18. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for				
Federal Assistance, filed with the State	☐Yes	□ No	X N/A	Remarks:
Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant	□ 1es	LINO	A IN/A	N/A to Area
requests received by the Department of Finance?				1.000 (1.
19. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met			3	
the criteria for legislative notification set forth in	Yes	☐ No	X N/A	Remarks:
Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?				N/A to Area
20. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	22.00		40000000	P
μαιροσέι	X Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
21. Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier				
Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed	☐Yes	☐ No	X N/A	Remarks:
through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they			23 13023	N/A to Area
are submitted to the funding agency?				
22. Are grant applications related to the Homeland				
Security Grant Program being routed through the	☐ Yes	☐ No	X N/A	Remarks: N/A to Area
Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?				N/A to Alea
Questions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Manageme	nt 11nts	Telephone and the	Same Sanction	NATION CONTINUES OF STREET STREET, STR
23. Has GMU prepared an annual Management	II Unit			
Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders	☐Yes	П No	□ N/A	Remarks:
soliciting participation in the Department's Highway				ivemarks.
Safety Program?				
24. Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment	1000			
to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis	☐ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive				
Assistants?				
25. Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement				
using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement	☐Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
to all commands with responsibility for or that have				rteriarity.
an interest in the project?				
26. Was a Memorandum of Understanding between				
involved commands outlining the responsibilities of	☐ Yes	☐ No	☐ N/A	Remarks:
each command prepared and distributed by GMU?				

submitted for 2009-2010.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command: Fresno	Division: Central	Number:
Evaluated by: Sergeant R. De	eChamplain	Date: 12/15/2009
Assisted by:		Date:

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected. Lead inspector's Signature: TYPE OF INSPECTION ☐ Division Level Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection Commander's Signatuçe: Follow-up Required: Follow-up Inspection \boxtimes No Yes For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6 Note: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked the "Remarks" section shall be utilized for explanation 1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted ⊠ N/A | Yes ∏ No Remarks: Has not occurred. a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner? Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities □ Yes ⊠ N/A □No Remarks: Grant funding of for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and this type is coordinated engineering studies, system development or program through the Grants implementations? Management Unit. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs Yes ⊠ No □ N/A Remarks: No requests were identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety located during inspection. Administration? 4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for □ No □ N/A Remarks: non-reimbursable overtime expenditures? Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management Yes □ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: The last concept Unit (GMU)? paper submitted by Area was May 2008. Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when ☐ Yes ☐ No ⊠ N/A Remarks: No papers

preparing concept paper budgets?

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6

Command Grant Management

_					
7.	acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	Yes	□ No	⊠ Ñ/A	Remarks: Area has no local grants to report on.
8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: This is handled by GMU.
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: This is handled by GMU.
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: This is handled by GMU.
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: There are no active grants that correspond to this item.
12.	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: There are no active grants that correspond to this item.
13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: This is handled by GMU.
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: This is handled by GMU.
15.	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: This is handled by GMU.
16.	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks This is handled by GMU.
17.	Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority? This would include any of the following: • Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor. • Applications for federal funds which exceed	☐ Yes	□No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: This is handled by GMU.
	the amount specified in the budget.				

Page

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

	8. Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant requests received by the Department of Finance?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: This is handled by GMU.
	9. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: This is handled by GMU.
	Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	 Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency? 	☐ Yes	□ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: This is handled by GMU.
22	2. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	☐ Yes	☐ No	⊠ N/A	Remarks: This is handled by GMU.
Quest	ions 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	t Unit			
23	ions 23:through 26:pertain to the Grants Management. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	t Unit ☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
23	ions 23:through 26: pertain to the Grants Management. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program? Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?			□ N/A	Remarks:
24	ions 23: through 26: pertain to the Grants Management. Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program? Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive	☐ Yes	□ No		

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAMEXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 3

Command: Fresno	Division: Central	Chapter:
Inspected by: Sergeant R.	DeChamplain	Date: 12/15/2009

Inspector's Comments:	Shall address non cor	ncurrence by commander	(e.g., findings revise	d, findings unchanged
etc.)				

COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM

EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 3 of 3

Command:	Division:	Chapter:	
Fresno	Central	6	
Inspected by:		Date:	
Sergeant R. DeChamplain		12/15/2009	

Required Action						
Corrective Action Plan/Timeline	STATE WHEN THE WARRIES AND STATE OF					
N/A – Beyond the upward notification initiated by this inspection, Area can not act.						
√1,						
		8				
Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE	DATE 12/18/05				
(INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	12/18/09 DATE 12/17/09				
Reviewer discussed this report with employee	REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE				
Concur Do not concur						